

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,060	12/16/2003	Thomas J. Dinger	LOT9-2003-0029-US1 (7321-	5227
46321 CAREY, ROD	7590 11/21/200 RIGUEZ, GREENBER	•	· EXAMINER	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE			HU, KANG	
SUITE 3020			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOCA RATO	BOCA RATON, FL 33487			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	H					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	10/737,060	DINGER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kang Hu	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2007.</li> <li>This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ol>						
Disposition of Claims						
4)	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/737,060 Page 2

Art Unit: 3714

#### DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendments to the specification and claims along with argument have been entered on 8/31/2007. Currently claims 1-19 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over George et al. (US 5,978,648).

Re claim 1, George teaches a method of administering learning objects within a learning management system, comprising the steps of: establishing within a computer system a learning folder for a particular learner in the learning management systems (LMS) which is separate from an existing course catalog of learning objects, the learning folder comprising a configuration to aggregate access to existing learning objects from a separate course catalog; George teaches that

Art Unit: 3714

the invention permits a student to download selected tasks for exporting for use at a remote location (col 11, 17-30) establishing a separate learning folder; which is separate from an existing course catalog. Adding within the computing system one or more of the learning objects to the learning folder; and, initially limiting access to the learning folder within the computing system to the particular learner. Although George does not explicitly teach of, but it would have been obvious that George categories each school (Fig 12c), each grade (Fig 3), and also by subjects of studies, one can also interpret that each of such different categories are viewed as a separate course catalog by themselves. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the student or the teacher to aggregate access to existing learning objects from a separate course catalog as taught in col 7, 25-40 where George teaches that the net worked nature of the system and method according to the present invention permits the user (teacher, student, administrator) to share the exemplar work with others throughout a school, community or state as is contemplated by the invention (Fig 32).

Claims 2-19 have been discussed above and in the previous office action dated 5/31/2007 and will not be repeated herein.

### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to the applicant's representative's argument that a working folder is different from the applicant's learning folder. The examiner respectively disagree that there is any difference between the two as they are both used for the same purpose of storing lessons and

Art Unit: 3714

course contents. As far as the newly amended subject matter of aggregate access to existing learning objects from a separate course catalog, George, with reasons provided above in the 102/103 rejection, also rejects the claims.

### Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kang Hu whose telephone number is (571)270-1344. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/737,060 Page 5

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KH/ Kang Hu November 15, 2007

> Ronald Laneau Trainer, AU 3714

> > 11/17/07